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Abstract
This study focuses on the problem of the effect of supervision and motivation on job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau with 38 people as the sample. While the questionnaire instrument from the respondents was taken directly. Then the data was analyzed quantitatively using SPSS 22 tools with simple linear regression analysis techniques and multiple linear regression. So it can be concluded that: (a) Partial supervision has an influence on job satisfaction (b) Motivation partially has an influence on job satisfaction. (c) The results of the study show that there is no significant effect simultaneously between supervision and motivation on job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau.
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1. Introduction
One of the important roles of human resources in a company is creating an effective work system. Because human resources are closely related to organizational strategy. To create good human resources in a company, it is necessary to have a monitoring and motivation system that is designed effectively so that employees can do their jobs well. Basically, the company's expectations for its employees are not only competent and skilled, but also the most important thing is that these employees have a great ability to work and develop optimally. Based on observations made by researchers at PT. Wahana Universe Linggau, the supervision carried out by the leadership on their employees is still not effective because there are still employees who do not work on time. In addition, researchers also found the problem that employees' motivation is still low at work so that many problems arise in the company. So this research needs to be done in order to develop the knowledge of employees and leaders how important the role of supervision and motivation is on employee job satisfaction.

This research was conducted at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau for with the intention the following objectives To determine the effect of supervision on employee job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau, To determine the effect of motivation on employee job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau and To determine the effect of supervision and motivation on employee job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau.

2. Literature Review
Supervision is basically fully directed to avoid the possibility of misappropriation or deviation from the objectives to be achieved. Supervision is the process of monitoring, evaluating, and reporting plans for achieving the goals set for corrective action for further
improvement (Fahmi 2016). Supervision is a managerial activity, carried out with the intention that there are no irregularities in carrying out work. A deviation or error occurs or not during the execution of work depending on the ability and skill level of the employees. Supervision carried out by the leadership, especially in the form of built-in control, is a managerial activity carried out with the intention that there are no irregularities in carrying out work (Kadarisman 2015). Supervision (controlling) of human resources is an activity carried out to control the implementation of tasks or work carried out by someone, so that the work process is in accordance with the desired results (Kadarisman 2015).

Supervision is a process to ensure that organizational and management goals are achieved (Fahmi 2016). Supervision is the process of setting performance measures and taking actions that can support the achievement of the expected results in accordance with the performance of the employees who have been determined. Controlling is the process of measuring performance and taking action to ensure desired results. Supervision is also a process to ensure that all activities carried out are in accordance with what has been planned. The process of ensuring that actual activities conform to the planned activities (Subagyo 2017).

Motivation is one of the things that influence human behavior, motivation is also known as a driver, desire, support or needs that can make a person excited and motivated to reduce and fulfill their own impulses, so that they can act and act according to certain ways that will lead to the optimal. Motivation is an encouragement that grows from within a person both from within and outside of himself to do work with high enthusiasm and use all the abilities and skills he has to achieve satisfaction according to what is desired (Ansory and Indrasari 2018). Motivation is a driving force that can trigger a person's work passion so that they want to work together, work effectively and integrate with all efforts to achieve satisfaction (Novia R. Silaen 2021). Motivation is an encouragement from within a person that causes that person to carry out certain activities in order to achieve a goal (Ansory and Indrasari 2018).

Each individual has a different level of satisfaction according to the rating system that applies to him. The higher the assessment of the activities felt in accordance with individual wishes, the higher the satisfaction with these activities. By fulfilling all the needs or desires in employees, a feeling of satisfaction will be created, and employees with a high level of satisfaction will automatically experience an increase in performance. Job satisfaction itself is defined as a positive attitude which is based on the evaluation results of what is expected to be obtained through the efforts made in carrying out a job with the results or rewards it receives (Suparyadi, 2015).

Job satisfaction is a feeling that supports or does not support an employee's self-related to his work or with his condition. Job satisfaction is basically something that is individual (Mangkunegara, 2011). Job satisfaction is a person's perspective, both positive and negative, about his work (Siagian, 2013). Job satisfaction is a pleasant or unpleasant emotional state for employees looking at their jobs (Eddy Sutrisno, 2014).

3. Research Method

Simple Linear Regression Test: Testing the relationship with the independent and dependent variables (Sugiyono, 2018). Correlation Coefficient Test: To prove the prediction of the relationship of a variable in the population by looking at the related
sample variables and calculating the coefficients between the variables in the sample (Sugiyono, 2018). T test: To test the significance using the t test. t arithmetic > t table at an error level of 5% or an error level of 1%, the t test or significance test is used to test the significance of the relationship (Sugiyono, 2018). Test Multiple Linear Regression: Test for the prediction of the dependent variable with the condition that there are at least 2 independent variables (Sugiyono, 2018). Determination Coefficient Test: To measure the influence of research variables simultaneously (Sugiyono, 2018). F test: To determine whether or not the independent variable influences the dependent variable simultaneously (Sugiyono, 2018).

4. Findings and Discussions

Simple Linear Regression Test

Supervision Variable (X1) on Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients (^{a})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

The table above is processed by SPSS version 22 in this test which obtained a constant of 11.740 with b = 0.927. Thus, the following is the regression equation:

\[ Y = a + b \times X_1 \]

Job Satisfaction = 11.740 + 0.927 supervision.

a = 11.740 a means that mark the 11,740 is mark consistent variable satisfaction work. bX = 0.927. That is, value satisfaction Work increase 0.927 each 1% value addition variable supervision. So that second variable This Havetendency.

Motivation Variable (X2) on Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients (^{a})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

The table above is processed by SPSS version 22 in this test which obtained a constant of 23.676 with b = 0.752. Thus, the following is the regression equation.
Y = a + bX1

Job Satisfaction = 23.676 + 0.752 motivation.

a = 23.676 a means that mark the 23,676 is mark consistent variable satisfaction work. bX = 23.676. That is, value satisfaction Work increase 23,676 each 1% value addition variable motivation. So that second variable This Have tendency.

Correlation Coefficient Test
Supervision Correlation Coefficient Test ( X 1 )

Summary models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted RSquare</th>
<th>std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.798^a</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>3,786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Monitoring

From this test, the coefficient value of supervision variable (X1) and job satisfaction (Y) is 0.798 at intervals of 0.000-1.000 and R Square is 0.637. This means that these two variables have a very strong influence because the correlation value is positive.

Motivation Correlation Coefficient Test ( X 2 )

Summary models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted RSquare</th>
<th>std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.593^a</td>
<td>.352,334</td>
<td>5,063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation

From this test, the coefficient values of motivation (X2) and job satisfaction (Y) were 0.593 at intervals of 0.000-1.000 and R Square 0.352. This means that these two variables have a very strong influence because the correlation value is positive.

T test
Supervision T Test ( X 1 )

Coefficients^a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>UnstandardizedCoefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>std.Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>11,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>,927</td>
<td>,117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

From the table the obtained results t testing that variable supervision (X1) of satisfaction work (Y) with t count > t table (2.239 > 2.208), t significant level = 0.0 31 < (a) 0.05. So that in a manner Partial H_a accepted and H_0 is rejected. So variable X1 effect against Y.
Motivational T Test (X2)

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>std. Error</td>
<td>Betas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>23,676</td>
<td>6,724</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>4,418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction
From the table the obtained results t testing that variable motivation \((X_2)\) against satisfaction work \((Y)\) with \(t\) count > \(t\) table \((3.521 > 2.208)\), \(t\) significant level = 0.01 < 0.05. So that in a manner Partial \(H_a\) accepted and \(H_0\) is rejected. So variable \(X_2\) has an effect against \(Y\).

Multiple Linear Regression Test

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>std. Error</td>
<td>Betas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>11.173</td>
<td>5,618</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>5,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction
From the processed SPSS version 22 in the test above, the following regression equation is obtained:

\[ Y = a + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 \]

\[ Y = 11.173 + 0.890 X_1 + 0.057 X_2 \]

\(a = 11.173\) a means that mark the 11.173 is mark constanta that showsmark variable satisfaction work 13.352 if second variables \((X_1\) and \(X_2))\) exist change .

\(bX_1 = 23.676 , bX_2 = 0.057\) . That is, value satisfaction Work increase each 1% value addition variable supervision And or motivation. So that second variable This Have tendency.

Correlation Coefficient Test

Summary models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>3,834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation, Monitoring
In this test it was found that there is a large influence between the 2 variables with the proven
value of $R = 0.799$ with a coefficient of $R^2 = 0.638$. So that these two variables contribute to $Y$.

F test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>908,502</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>454,251</td>
<td>30,898</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>514,551</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14,701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1423,053</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction
b. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation, Monitoring

Calculated F value $3.0.898 > \text{Ftable}(3, 26)$, significance level $0.000 < \text{Ftable}(a) 0.05$, $f = (k, nk) = 2-38 = 3.26$. This is what makes $H_0$ is rejected and $H_a$ is accepted. Kindly simultaneous second variable this influence significant for variable dependent, so the hypothesis is accepted.

The following are the results of the research that has been conducted regarding the influence of supervision and motivation on job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau rides:

The correlation coefficient in the study on supervisory variables ($X_1$) to satisfaction ($Y$) has a significant relationship to job satisfaction ($Y$) with $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}} (2.203 > 2.208)$, significance $= 0.031 < 0.05$, simple linear regression results are obtained $b = 0.927$, $a = 11.740$. Thus the monitoring variable has a significant effect on job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semsta Linggau. These results are consistent with research (Fitrianingrum, 2015) regarding the effect of supervision with work discipline at the Samarinda Ulu District Office, Samarinda City. Obtained $r_{xy} > r_{xy \text{table}} (0.775 > 0.381)$, $N = 27$, and a constant of 5% with a simple regression test obtained $Y' = 6.48 + 1.15X$.

The results of the study show that the correlation coefficient between motivational variables ($X_2$) and satisfaction ($Y$) has a significant relationship to job satisfaction ($Y$) with $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}} (2.521 > 2.208)$ with regression results simple linear obtained $b = 0.752$, $a = 23.676$. Thus the motivation variable has a significant effect on job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau. These results are in accordance with research (Rizal Radiman, 2019) regarding the influence of work discipline motivational variables at the Public Works and Public Housing Office of Aceh Tamiang Regency. The difference, in previous research is not significant. From the partial test, it was found that $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}} (1.254 > 1.668) r_{xy} > r_{xy \text{table}} (0.775 > 0.381)$, a significance of $0.214 > 0.05$.

The results showed that the resulting significance value was $0.055 > 0.05$, $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}} (1.989 > 2.208)$, with linear regression results obtained $b_{X1} = 0.890$ $b_{X2} = 0.057$ and $a = 11.173$. From the value of $R = 0.799$ it is evident that the two variables $X_1$ and $X_2$ have a strong influence. Supported by the results of the coefficient of determination $= 0.638$, which means that these two variables also contribute to each other. As well as obtaining $F_{\text{count}} > F_{\text{table}} (30.898 > 3.26)$, the simulaneous significance is $0.000 < (a) = 0.05, F (k, nk) = F (2-38) = 3.26$. This shows that $H_a$ is accepted and $H_0$ is rejected. So that the
influence of the two variables is significant on job satisfaction.

5. Conclusion

Following are the conclusions from this study: (1) The results of the analysis carried out were obtained that hypothesis First (H1) on variable supervision (X1) exists influence significant to satisfaction work at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau. Obtained t count > t table (2.203 > 2.208) and significance 0.031 < 0.05. This become because Ho was rejected and Ha accepted. It means, Correct exists if variable the influence significant to satisfaction work. (2) The results of the analysis carried out were obtained that hypothesis Both (H2) exist influence significant variable motivation (X2) to satisfaction work at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau. Obtained t count > t table (2.521 > 2.208) and significance 0.001 < 0.05. This becomes cause ho is rejected and Ha accepted. It means, Correct exists if variable the influence significant to satisfaction work. (3) The results of the analysis carried out were obtained that hypothesis Third (H3) on variable supervision motivation (X1) and motivation (X2) exists influence significant to satisfaction work at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau. Obtained t count > t table (1.989 > 2.208) and significance 0.055 < 0.05 with the results of linear regression obtained bX 1 = 0.890 bX 2 = 0.057 and a = 11.173. As well as obtaining F count > F table (30.898 > 3.26), the simulranean significance is 0.000 < (a) = 0.05, F (k, nk) = F (2-38) = 3.26. This shows that Ha is acceptedand Ho is rejected. It means, Correct exists if second variable the influence significant to satisfaction work.
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